

Attorney Docket No. P13081-US1  
Customer Number 27045

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

#### **1.) Claim Amendments**

The Applicants have amended claims 1, 4-5, 8-10, 12-24, 26-27; and claims 29-30 have been added. Support for the amendments to the claims and for the new claims can be found at least at page 10, line 31 to page 12, line 4 of the application as originally filed. Accordingly, claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### **2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In paragraphs 1-2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 12-15, 18-19, 21-22 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saarela, et al. (US 6,366,785) in view of Megyesi (US 5,544,230). The Applicants have amended claims 1, 12-15, 18-19, 21-22 and 25 to add method and apparatus claim elements relating to an audio playback unit in a first communications device. The Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Saarela and Megyesi do not suggest at least the features of independent claims 1, 12, 13, and 18, as amended.

Claims 2-3 depend directly and indirectly from amended independent claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Claim 26 depends from amended independent claim 12 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 12. Claim 27 depends from amended independent claim 13 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 13. Claim 28 depends from amended claim 18 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 18. Therefore, the allowance of claims 1-3, 12-15, 18-19, 21-22 and 25-28 is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saarela in view of Megyesi, and further in view of Segal, et al. (US 6,167,251). The Applicants have amended the claims 4-5, 8-9, and the independent claim 1 from which they depend. The Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Saarela, Megyesi, and Segal do not suggest at least the

Amendment - PAGE 8 of 10  
EUS/J/P/05-9245

Attorney Docket No. P13081-US1  
Customer Number 27046

features of claims 4-9, as amended. Therefore, the allowance of claims 4-5, 8-9 is respectfully requested

Claims 6 and 7 depend from amended claim 5, which depends indirectly on amended claim 1, and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claims 5 and 1. Therefore, the allowance of claims 6 and 7 is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 16-17, 20 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saarela in view of Megyesi, and further in view of Schuster, et al. (US 6,446,127). The Applicants have amended claims 16-17, 20 and 23-24 to further distinguish the claimed invention from Saarela, Megyesi, and Schuster. Further, the Applicants have amended independent claim 13 from which claims 16-17 depend and claim 13 from which claims 20 and 23-24 indirectly depend. The Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Saarela, Megyesi and Schuster do not suggest at least the features of claims 16-17, 20 and 23-24 and independent claims 12, 13, and 18, as amended. Therefore, the allowance of claims 16-17, 20 and 23-24 is respectfully requested

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saarela in view of Megyesi, and Segal, and further in view of Abecassis, et al. (US 6,192,340). The Applicants have amended claim 10 and independent claim 1 from which claim 10 depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Saarela, Megyesi, Segal and Abecassis. Therefore, the allowance of claims 10-11 is respectfully requested

### CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-30.

Amendment - PAGE 9 of 10  
EUS/J/P/05-9245

Attorney Docket No. P13081-US1  
Customer Number 27045

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Cameron  
Registration No. 50,298

Date: November 10, 2005

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4145  
michael.cameron@ericsson.com